

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants note that the remarks and amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals presented to the Examiner during the telephone call of May 17, 2007.

The Non Final Office Action, mailed April 2, 2007, considered and rejected claims 1-40.¹ By this response, claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 12-14, 22-24, 26-28, 30-33, 35, and 39-40 have been amended², claims 15-21 have been canceled and dependent claims 41-44 have been added such that claims 1-14 and 22-44 remain pending, of which 1, 9, 27 and 35 are the only independent claims at issue.

Applicants' claimed invention is generally directed to embodiments for managing multiple credentials in a distributed system. The embodiment of claim 1, for example recites a method for associating multiple credentials with a single user account such that the user may be authenticated with any one of the multiple credentials utilizing a service that is accessed by a user from one or more devices with varying input capabilities. In the method, the authentication service receives an authentication request from a device, wherein credentials of the user are included in the authentication request. The credentials provided by the user are then validated, wherein the credentials are associated with a unique user identifier of the user, a user account, and a user profile. The authentication system receives new credentials from the user, wherein the new credentials are associated with the same unique user identifier of the user, user account, and user profile. The new credentials are stored in a credential store of the authentication system such that the authentication system can authenticate the user to the service when the user

¹ Claims 1 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Moreh et al. (Patent No.: US 6,959,336 B2), hereinafter Moreh. Claims 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Laursen et al. (Patent No.: US 6,065,120), hereinafter Laursen. Claims 4-6, 9-11, 30-32 and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Laursen. Claims 7 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Leah et al. (Patent No.: US 6,986,039 B1), hereinafter Leah. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Leah and further in view of Wood et al. (Patent No.: US 6,609,198 B1), hereinafter Wood. Claims 2-3, 28-29 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Wood. Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen in view of Leah. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen in view of Wood. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laursen in view of Leah and further in view of Wood. Claims 12-13 and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Laursen and further in view of Wood. Claims 14 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Laursen and further in view of Leah. Claims 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moreh in view of Wood, in view of Laursen and further in view of Leah.

provides any one of the multiple credentials associated with the user account. The authentication system provides, in response to the request, the unique user identifier and the user profile to the device.

The methods recited in claims 1 and 9 are similar, but whereas claim 1 is recited from the perspective of the authentication system, claim 9 is recited from the perspective of a system interacting with the authentication system. Claims 27 and 35, the only other independent claims at issue, are computer program product claims corresponding to the methods recited in claims 1 and 9, respectively.

Initially, it will be noted that all of the independent claims have been amended to clarify that the credentials of the user are associated with both a unique user identifier and a user profile and that they are both provided in response to a request for authentication. Support for these limitations is found throughout the specification, including, but not limited to the disclosure of ¶ [040].

As discussed with the Examiner, none of the cited art, when considered alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the claimed invention. Infact, while Moreh generally discloses that a single user can be associated with different sets of credentials and while Laursen generally teaches that different authentication methods can be used for validating the credentials provided by the user on different devices, there is nothing in Moreh or Laursen that would teach or suggest that a user, having a plurality of credentials, is associated with a single unique user identifier, a user account, and a user profile, wherein both the profile and the user identifier are provided in response to authentication requests, as claimed. Instead, and at most, the art merely suggests that a user identifier is provided in response to an authentication request.

The other cited art, namely, Wood, and Leah also fail to compensate for the foregoing inadequacies of Moreh and Laursen, insofar as they also fail to teach or suggest any embodiment in which a user's credentials are associated with a single unique user identifier, a user account, and a user profile, wherein both the profile and the user identifier are provided in response to authentication requests.³

³ In fact, it will be noted that Wood and Leah were only cited in rejecting dependent claims and were not asserted as disclosing any such embodiment teach or suggest any embodiment in which a user's credentials are associated with a unique user identifier, a user account, and a user profile, wherein both the profile and the user identifier are provided in response to authentication requests.

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing, as well as for the other reasons discussed with the Examiner, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the rejections to the claims are now moot.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 2nd day of July, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
JOHN C. BACOCK
Registration No. 59,890
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

JCJ:ahy
AHY0000003870V001